

#	MODE/ PROJECT	2004 RTP	STRATEGIES	COST	FINANCIAL COMMITMENTS	PROS	CONS	POLICY DISCUSSION/OPTIONS	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
1	Operations and System Preservation	Yes - Partial	Routine maintenance and early infrastructure repairs. Operational improvements (small physical improvements and technology deployments).	\$66 billion (through 2035)	\$40 billion commitment (\$26 billion unfunded)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintains or increases mobility - Maintains or increases safety - Maintains or increases efficiency - Improves public safety - Early minor repairs prevent expensive major repairs in the future - Lower cost for maintenance - More cost-effective than capacity expansion projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inadequate funding commitment - Less money is available for expensive capacity expansion projects - Politically unpopular (low-profile) 	<div>1) Increase level of funding in the Core RTP by up to 40% (\$10 billion) above current commitments, recognizing capital investment tradeoffs.</div> <div>2) Main status quo (no additional funding beyond current commitments).</div>	Support Option 1. Requisite Milestones: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase in state gas tax and potential bond funding
2	I-710 tunnel	Yes - not as tunnel & not tolled	Gap closure from I-10 to I-210	\$3-4 billion	Technical study completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increases capacity (one of the best performing capacity projects) - Relieves congestion - Fills in critical gap in the regional network - Tunnel is more environmentally sensitive option - Addresses community concerns - Private investment community has expressed interest in this project (prime candidate for PPP financing) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inadequate funding commitment - Expensive investment alternative - Longstanding community opposition - Geological/seismic risks - Safety risks 	<div>1) Include in the Core RTP.</div> <div>2) Include in the Strategic Plan (not part of Federally approved, conforming RTP).</div>	Support Option 1. Requisite Milestones: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - local funding commitment (via MTA's planning documents or board resolutions) - financial/business plan with adequate analysis of tolls and other funding sources - supporting documentation of private sector interest
3	High Desert Corridor	No	New freeway/tollway connecting LA County and SB County	\$5 billion	Over \$70 million committed from SANBAG for portion east of US-395; \$0 commitment from Metro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increases capacity - Relieves congestion - Provides east-west connection between high-growth areas - Allows through-traffic, including goods movement, to bypass congested urban core 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inadequate funding commitment - Environmental concerns 	<div>1) Include in the Core RTP.</div> <div>2) Include in the Strategic Plan (not part of Federally approved, conforming RTP).</div>	Support Option 1. Requisite Milestones: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - local funding commitment (via MTA's planning documents or board resolutions) - financial/business plan with adequate analysis of tolls and other funding sources
4	CETAP Riverside County-Orange County Corridor	Yes	A) New facility on or parallel to SR-91 alignment, plus B) New facility connecting Riverside County and Orange County	\$9.8 billion	Planning study completed; Funding for Corridor A (\$925 million) included in OCTA LRTP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relieves SR-91 congestion - Provides additional intercounty connection between Riverside County and Orange County 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inadequate funding commitment - Environmental concerns - Right-of-way issues - Requires further study & consensus building 	<div>1) Include in the Core RTP.</div> <div>2) Include in the Strategic Plan (not part of Federally approved, conforming RTP).</div>	Support Option 1 for Corridor A, Option 2 for Corridor B Requisite Milestones: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - local funding commitment from RCTC for Corridor A
5	I-5 HOV and Truck Lanes	No	HOV and truck climbing lanes on I-5 in Santa Clarita	\$1 billion	\$10 million planning funds for Draft EIR/EIS (includes \$1.5 million SAFETEA-LU earmark)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increases capacity - Relieves I-5 congestion - Improves public safety - Expands HOV network - Facilitates movement of trucks on major truck corridor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inadequate funding commitment - Potential environmental/right-of-way issues 	<div>1) Include in the Core RTP.</div> <div>2) Include in the Strategic Plan (not part of Federally approved, conforming RTP-- this option jeopardizes the EIR/EIS).</div>	Support Option 1 Requisite Milestones: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - local funding commitment (via MTA's planning documents or board resolutions)
6	US-101 Corridor	Yes	2 HOT lanes in each direction from Ventura County Line to SR-134/SR-170	\$4.4 billion	Planning study completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increases capacity - Relieves congestion, improves mobility - Addresses intercounty commute 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inadequate funding commitment - Right-of-way constraints - Major community opposition - Requires further study & consensus building 	<div>1) Include in the Core RTP.</div> <div>2) Include in the Strategic Plan (not part of Federally approved, conforming RTP).</div>	Support Option 2 and continue further study.